

COBBETT's WEEKLY POLITICAL REGISTER.

VOL. 52.—No. 6.] LONDON, SATURDAY, Nov. 6, 1824. [Price 1s.

TO THE EDINBURGH REVIEWERS.

On the Religion of America; on their Doctrine relating to Manufacturing; and on their Opinions relating to Population.

Kensington, 3d Nov. 1824.

GENTLEMEN,

In your Review for the month of July last, or, rather, that was published in July last, there are some things, which I think it my duty to notice. These things are mentioned above, and form the title to this letter. Your publication, which is pretty nearly as old as mine, has acquired, and I do not say unjustly acquired, a good deal of weight with its readers; and, therefore, as those readers are unquestionably very numerous, errors which are promulgated by you, it is the more necessary to endeavour to correct.

With regard to the first subject, above mentioned, *the religion of the United States of America*. I

refer to your article on the works of Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. HODGSON, and an ENGLISH GENTLEMAN, which article begins at page 427, of your aforementioned Review. Mr. DUNCAN had spoken in terms of lofty panegyric on the religious liberty of the United States; and you, taking Mr. DUNCAN's eulogium for your text, take the opportunity to observe, that America is, in this respect, far superior to every other country in the world. The state of America as to religion would seem to be a state of perfection in your eyes. "It is not all gold that glitters;" it is very true, that the Government of the United States, and, generally, the State governments also, have acted with justice and with great wisdom in this respect. It is also true, that a man's religion is no bar to the pursuit of any lawful interest, or any object of ambition. As far as the governments are concerned; and as far as public matters can possibly have any thing to do with religion, there is an impartial and perfect disregard

of all sects; which perfect disregard on the part of the governments produces an absence of all rivalship on this account.

But, Gentlemen, there are still *religious evils* in the United States of America. None that the Government can be said to be answerable for; but still they exist, of which, indeed, there is evidence enough in the books, the review of which has called forth this article from you. The country is overrun with wild fanatics and crafty knaves, disturbing the minds of the common people, and pocketing their money in exchange. The Government cannot prevent this; but surely it is a thing that one would wish to see prevented; surely it would be better if there were **ONE RELIGION**, and only one; and if all these innumerable swarms of fanatics and knaves could find no food wheron to exist.

I am not pretending that it would be wise in the American Government, to take any measures for causing these crowds of fanatics and knaves to be put down, and to cause one single faith to prevail; but, still, I must deem the existence of these bands of fanatics and knaves a great evil; I must lament that the minds of honest people are incessantly ha-

rassed, and their pockets continually picked by these fanatics and knaves; and I cannot join you in believing, that, in this respect, "the Americans are at the head of all the nations in the world."

We must allow, I think, that there will *always be religion of some sort* in every country upon earth, as long as people *continue to die*. So long as this makes part of human nature, men will have a heaven to hope for, and a hell to fear. This will be the constant habit of thinking of the great mass of mankind. There will be some few, and a very few indeed, to reason themselves out of these hopes and fears. There always have been a few of this description amongst all the nations that we know any thing of. It is curious enough that every "infidel" writer; that is to say, every unbelieving writer, appears to have the vanity to think that he has made a discovery. Mr. CARLILE and the Unitarians think that they have made a wonderful discovery. The former, indeed, gives to MONSIEUR DIDEROT the merit of discovering that there were "three great impostors; Moses, Jesus Christ, and Mahomet." The Unitarians are quite witty on their discovery, that "none but fools can suppose that God, the

" creator of us all, could be born
" of a virgin."

The vanity of these gentlemen will receive a little check, when they are told that those discoveries were made, at the very least, seven hundred years ago. One of the charges of Pope GREGORY the Ninth, against the Emperor Frederick the Second, was expressed in these words : " He has said that " the whole world had been de- " ceived by three famous impos- " tors, Moses, Jesus Christ, and " Mahomet ; still putting Jesus " Christ, crucified, beneath the " two others who died with ho- " nour ; he has, besides, dared to " say, that none but fools can be- " lieve that God, the creator of " every thing, could be born of a " virgin ; that man could be born " otherwise than by an union of " the sexes ; and that nothing " ought to be believed which was " not agreeable to natural rea- " son." Upon this charge, toge- ther with others, the Pope at- tacked the Emperor with all the thunders of the church ; and in a short time, he compelled him to *recant*, to publish his profession of faith, and to talk of Jesus Christ, Moses, and Mahomet, as a Christian ought to talk.

So that, at any rate, the doc- trine of the conceited Unitarians

has not novelty to recommend it, and Monsieur Diderot was a pla- giarist from the Emperor Frede- rick the Second. There have, then, always been a few to set re- ligious belief at defiance ; but, as long as men continue to die, there will be religion ; and this religion will always have a very consider- able effect upon men's feelings and conduct towards their neigh- bours, as well as towards the State to which they owe allegiance and obedience. Is not this, then, a matter for Government to meddle with ? Would it not be a happy thing, if there were but *one religion* in one and the same country ? I by no means blame any of the governments of the United States for their not meddling with the matter ; but I cannot think, that, in this respect, those States are as well situated as those nations of Europe are where there is but one. If the Government decline to med-dle with the matter, and make no provision for a priesthood, it is very clear that religion will be- come a TRADE ; that, like other trades, it will produce COM- PETITION ; that, like the sel-lers of liquors pleasing to the appetite, one religion-seller will strive to outdo the other in his commodity ; and, you yourselves state, that " fanaticism of every

" description seems to rage and flourish in America ; that they have their prophets and prophetesses, their preaching-en-campments, female preachers, and every species of noise and of nonsense." These cannot be good things. Every one must allow that it would be better if there were but one religion. It cannot be a good thing, that the common people should have their minds distracted and their pockets picked by these eager competitors in the trade of religion, the whole of whom must *preach falsehood*, observe, except one of them, and perhaps that one too.

Therefore, Gentlemen, I cannot help thinking, that there are many states of Europe better off than America in this one respect. If the Government interfere and cause the religion to be one, there must be an establishment, and an establishment must have a provision made for it in some shape or other. Then arises this question : Which is best for the community : to make this provision, the extent of which is known, or to defray all the charges arising out of the competition in the trade of religion ? I much question whether a Roman Catholic priesthood, maintained at the public charge in America, would cost

the people so much money (to say nothing about the harassing of their minds) as they now have to pay in consequence of the religious competition. The payments, indeed, which they now make, appear to be *voluntary* ; but they are by no means quite voluntary, in some cases, as you and I could wish. I do not wish you to go, each of you with your wife and family, to settle in some township in America, where you would be constantly under the observing eye of your neighbours. I wish you to stay here and to write reviews ; otherwise, I should really like to see you, comfortably sitting down, each in some pleasant village north of the Capes of the Delaware. And, in one of these villages, having an Episcopal Church, a Presbyterian, a Baptist, a Methodist, a Lutheran, and, perhaps, another or two. I should like to see Mr. JEFFREY, for instance, thus seated down, with a couple of sons beginning to look out for wives, and a couple of daughters beginning to look out for husbands. Understanding all about religion much better than the preachers in these "houses of God," he would, very likely, not think of giving a good handful of dollars every year to one of the preachers. Still less

would he think, perhaps, of sending the priest in a corde of wood, and a quarter of beef, or half a hog in November. Still less would he think, than this, I dare say, of sending Mrs. JEFFREY, at Christmas, to the preacher's wife with half a dozen pounds of candles, a pound of tea, two or three pounds of coffee, and a certain quantity of spun flax, cotton, or wool. These things would never come into the head of Mr. JEFFREY; yet, if they did not come into his head and out of his pocket, before the end of one year from the time of his sitting down, I can assure him, that he would be (if he were any where but in a large city) very nearly in the situation of the kings in old times, when laying under the interdict and excommunication of the Pope! He and his family would be shunned as if stricken with a pestilence.

I saw an English gentleman, in the year 1819, who was settled, most delightfully, in one of these villages. He and his family had been received in the village with all possible hospitality and kindness. The time came for the payment to the preacher, and the only place of worship, as they called it, in the village, was one of the Episcopal Church. The ELDERS,

or head men, who collect the money in such cases, went to him as a matter of course. He expressed his surprise at the object of their visit; but at last offered them three or four dollars, and expressed his determination to send neither wood, meat, candles, nor tea. They quitted him with great civility; but he immediately found every door in the village shut against him and his family; and his solitude became as complete as that of Robinson Crusoe.

This anecdote rests upon my word and upon that of my friend; but what have we in the melancholy history of Mr. BIRKBECK? He tells us, in his first pamphlet from the *prairies*, that scarcely had he arrived upon the spot, when he received a letter from a *preacher* (of God knows what sect) tendering his ghostly services to the new colony. Mr. BIRKBECK, unhappily for him, thought he might disport himself a little with this impertinent preacher; he told him (I quote from memory), that when he reflected that all around him was so flourishing; that the trees had grown to so amazing a height and size, and that the meadows had annually brought their surprising superabundance of grass; when he reflected that the land had been so blessed for so

many ages without the assistance of any preacher, he could not but believe that they would still continue to flourish without such assistance. But that, if he should, nevertheless, find a preacher necessary, he would certainly give the first offer to this obliging and generous applicant. Alas ! Mr. BIRKBECK really knew not where he was. Infidel, Atheist, all sorts of opprobrious names were heaped upon him. Even his Quaker money-agents at Philadelphia threatened him (at a critical period in his affairs) *to close his account!* An interdict was pronounced on him and his colony ; and, in order to avoid instant ruin, he wrote and *published* a letter, containing a miserable attempt to explain away the meaning of the passage I have alluded to ; professed his firm belief in the Christian faith ; and said, in conclusion ; " as a proof of my sincerity, my team is this day employed in DRAWING LOGS TO BUILD A MEETING-HOUSE !" It was foolish to say any thing at all about the application of the preacher ; but, having said it, I would have consigned the prairies, the Wabash, " the mountain nymph, sweet liberty," the preacher, and all the preachers, and all their con-

gregations to the devil ; and would have come home, and would have cracked stones in the parish of Wanborough, before I would have set my horses to draw logs for a meeting-house.

Now, Gentlemen, we want nothing but this to convince us that the payment is not voluntary. Many applications were made to me, during the time that I lived in that country. I objected upon the fairest and most reasonable grounds. I belonged to the Church of England ; and I would have nothing to do with their Episcopal church, because they had left the word HELL out of the Apostle's Creed ; because they had left the *absolution* out of the visitation of the sick ; and because they had left out the *prayers for the king, queen, and royal family.* They used to endeavour to convince me that this was *bigotry* in me ; but I assured them that my conscience would not permit me to give my money to support a heresy, nor even to attend those places where it was inculcated. In this way I got out of the difficulty, and always lived most harmoniously with my neighbours. They regretted that I could not join them in prayer ; but I amply compensated by joining them most heartily in smoking and talking.

These things show, Gentlemen, that there are customs, with regard to religion in America, which have very great power. I was told, at Harrisburgh, of a Doctor of Medicine, who had very great practice, and who was highly esteemed, and who was compelled with his family even to quit such a place as SPITSBURGH, because he was heard to utter some expressions, very little more *liberal* than many of those which you fearlessly put forth in your reviews. Considering, then, all these real expenses, and all these inconveniences, though the Government and the laws let you say and do what you will in regard to religion; though as to offices and public authority the Government will not suffer religion to interfere; and though, in fact, you may refuse all payment if you will; and further, though the ministers of religion, where the congregations are numerous and respectable, are generally men of exemplary lives; still there is quite enough of inconvenience, arising out of a competition in the trade of religion, to make every sensible man wish that there were but ONE, though that one created an establishment maintained at the public charge.

But, then, this establishment must be *efficient* for its purposes;

and, I must now observe, that I quoted you partially, just now. You said, that the fanaticism, noise and nonsense, in America, "which has no *establishment*, is in "about the same proportion that "it is here, *under the nose of an established church*." Very true: the noise, folly and nonsense are here prodigious: exceeded a little, perhaps, by the Jumpers in America, and by the preaching and fornicating encampments in the woods of that country: exceeded a little by these, but not much. But this religious establishment of ours has, in fact, very little to do with religion. What has the establishment in Ireland to do with religion? The whole of the establishment seems to be, in its very nature, intended to create and to foster numerous sects. It does not answer the purposes of an establishment, the first object of which ought to be to secure an uniformity in religious belief, and to prevent all the evils naturally arising from religion becoming a trade, and a matter of individual competition amongst the traders; and this is not to be effected without the interference of the Government. Again I have to observe, that no blame attaches to the American or State Governments. They have done the best.

that they could do ; but, they have not been without their own inconveniences and mortifications with regard to religious matters. To humour the people, acting somewhat from the motives of poor Mr. BIRKBECK in his recantation, the Congress has been induced to have ministers of the Gospel say prayers to them. For many years, in order to balance things a little, they had an *Episcopal* minister to say prayers to the *Senate*, and a *Presbyterian* minister to say prayers to the House of Representatives. Latterly, (whether they have succeeded or not I do not know), the *Methodists* and *Independents* have been striving to get at the performance of a share of these prayers. It was farcical enough to see one religion going on in one house, and another in the other, each holding the other sufficiently in abhorrence ; but, if the mongrel crews should carry their points, which it is very likely they may, the scene will become so contemptible, as to make any man worthy of public confidence ashamed of sitting in either House. The State Governments are compelled to resort to similar means to conciliate the different sects, and, when all these inconveniences are considered, you will not, I think,

retain your opinion, that, as to matters of religion, "the Americans are at the head of all the nations in the world."

I now come, Gentlemen, to the second subject of my letter ; namely, your doctrine relative to manufacturing, which I find in page 370 and 371 of the aforementioned Review. You are of opinion that the land should be put into large farms ; that as few persons as possible should be employed in the affairs of agriculture ; that they should make no " clumsy attempts to manufacture " their own produce ; and that the " manufacturing should be carried " on by a distinct class ; and, by " this system, you say that the " *national wealth*, and the *comforts of all classes*, are pro- " digiously augmented."

You are writing upon the law of entails ; and you make a comparison between the situation of France and of England. You say, that " while there are more than " TWO THIRDS of the people of " France employed in their in- " ferior cultivation, less than ONE " THIRD of our people suffice to " carry on the infinitely superior " system of cultivation adopted " in this country." You then, in proof of your correctness with re-
gard to this one-third, say, that,

" according to the census of 1821, there are 2,941,374 families in Great Britain, of which only 978,657 are employed in agriculture."

Now, supposing this census to be correct, do you suppose that the 1,350,239 families which are said to be employed in trade, handicraft, and manufactures; do you suppose that these have nothing to do with agriculture? Do you suppose, Gentlemen, that these persons are employed in works of manufacture? Do you suppose that they have nothing to do with the cultivation of the land? Has the wheelwright, the blacksmith, the collar-maker, the bricklayer that works at the farm-houses, the carpenter that works upon the farms, nothing to do with agriculture? These are all included in your families that are employed in trade, manufactures, and handicraft; but are they not as much attached to the land as the ploughman and the woodman? Nay, and what is the shoemaker that makes shoes for the farmer and his men? What is the village tailor? And what in short are all the inhabitants of an agricultural village or town? Do not those who make the plough belong to the land as much as those who use the plough? In the village of Botley,

this very census tells us, that there are *forty* families generally employed in agriculture, and seventy families chiefly employed in trade, manufacture, and handicraft. Now the fact is, that there is one family of chair-makers, one family of broomstick-makers about two families of tanners, about three families of millers, about two families employed in a coal-yard; and with the exception of these, every soul in the parish, the parson and the doctor, and their families excepted, is employed directly in agriculture, or in making the materials and the clothes for agricultural people; or in supplying them with meat, bread, drink, and other necessaries. There is the market-town of Bishop's Waltham, just by Botley. More than a third part of its families are put down to trade, handicraft and manufactures. There is a man at Bishop's Waltham that makes *brushes*, and there is a tan-yard in the town. With the exception of these, and the parson and a couple of attorneys, and an admiral and a miller and their families, every soul in the parish is either employed in agriculture, or in making implements or clothes, or supplying articles to people employed in agriculture. Here is no *trade*; here are no *manufactures*. The

people essentially belong to the land as much as the ploughmen do. There are said to be ten families chiefly employed in trade and manufactures, even in the parish of DURLY, on the other side of Botley. There is a farmer's wife in that parish that makes straw bonnets; and that is the only manufactory that that parish ever saw. The whole is completely belonging to agriculture.

Your view of the matter, therefore, is extremely fallacious. But it proceeds from the fashionable desire to swell the number of manufacturers; and to cause it to be believed, that we have a million and a quarter of families in Great Britain, employed solely in making goods to be sent abroad. This is the vulgar notion; the notion that delights the great vulgar beyond imagination; and the stupid landowners, though the notion is manifestly so injurious to them, never make an effort to expose its falsehood. You say here, that "only a proportionally small number of the inhabitants are employed in the cultivation of the soil." Why, if this be true, the landowners are comparatively an *insignificant class*. The rest of the people, you say, "are employed in manufacturing industry;" if we believe this, the

workshop is the greatest thing we have to look to, the land is a mere trifle; and this is the notion that has been industriously inculcated for a great many years.

If the landowners in parliament had been as anxious about their own interests, and their real consequence in the country, as they have been about their pheasants and their hares, we should have had a census in a very different form. Instead of this column of "trade, manufactures, " and handicraft," we should have had several columns, as thus: families employed in foreign commerce and on the sea; families employed in cotton mills and cotton factories; families employed in woollen factories; families employed in stocking-weaving; families employed in the iron, gold, copper, and lead mines; families employed in country towns and villages in the making of any articles to be sent away from those towns and villages, other than for the use of persons employed in agriculture. If we had had a return like this, you would have seen what a contemptible figure your manufacturers would have made. You would have seen, that, about a hundred thousand families would have been the very utmost that could have been placed to the

account of *congregated* manufacturers. This is a monstrous number, making as it does *half a million* of persons.

In speaking of the *two thirds* of the people of France employed in agriculture, you seem to forget that the women and children of those persons are manufacturers, that they make clothes not only for themselves, but to carry to the market and sell to others who do not manufacture. This, I insist, is a great benefit to the land; and of this benefit the land of England has been robbed. This brings us to the main point that I have in view: namely, your opinion, that it is injurious to a country

agricultural people should meddle with the manufacturing of their own produce, and your assertion, that "the *national wealth*, and the *comforts of all classes* are prodigiously ~~aug-~~^{ed}," by separating manufactures from agriculture. I have lately proved the contrary of this to be true. What you mean by *national wealth*, I can never understand; but I know what is meant by "*comforts of all classes*;" and I also know, that of those comforts the Parliamentary Reports clearly prove that the most numerous class in this country has been completely stripped. On the other

hand, it is a fact denied by nobody, that the most numerous class in France are in a state of great ease and happiness. Men of all parties are forward to declare this; and my son James tells us in his book, that he saw, throughout the whole of the eight hundred miles that he travelled in France, the females of the agricultural families partly engaged in manufacturing. He tells us that he everywhere saw the women and girls employed dressing hemp or flax, carding, spinning, and knitting. Now, it being notorious that the people of France are in a state of great ease and happiness, and it being equally notorious that our people are in a state of the greatest misery and degradation, how are we to conclude otherwise, than that your opinions, as to this matter, are erroneous?

But, Gentlemen, have you overlooked *America*? You will not presume to deny, that domestic manufactures go there hand in hand with agriculture. Now, you dwell with delight, in this same Review, on the prosperity and happiness of the people of that country; and yet, in the same Review, (page 371,) you commend the agricultural people of England, for "not spending their time in '*clumsy attempts*' to

manufacture their own produce." You see the people of America as happy as they can be, while this domestic manufacturing is universal in all but the slave-states; you see the people of England steeped into misery, while this domestic manufacturing has been wholly destroyed: and, with both these sights before you, you insist, that, to abandon domestic manufactures is the way prodigiously to *augment the comforts of all classes!*

However, "encore un coup," as the French preachers say. You quote from one of the books on America (page 439 of the same Review) a passage in the following words: "An American can "make candles if he have tallow; "can distil brandy if he have "grapes or peaches, and can "make beer if he have malt and "hops, without asking leave of "any one, and much less with "any fear of incurring punishment. How would a farmer's "wife there be astonished, if told "it was contrary to law for her "to make soap out of the potash "obtained on the farm, and of the "grease which she herself had "saved!"

You, Gentlemen, preface this quotation. Speak loudly of the real blessings enjoyed in America.

Prodigious! In the previous article of this same Review, and only a few pages back, you had said, that *clumsy attempts* to manufacture their own produce would be a great evil to the agricultural people of England. Consistently with this doctrine, you should have told the Americans, that they were fools for spending their time in making their own candles, in making their own brandy, and in making their own beer. You should have told them, that this was not the way to create "national wealth;" that this was a vicious division of labour; and contrary to the principles of the great ADAM SMITH. You should have told this American farmer's wife, that she was a great goose for making soap out of her own grease and potash, and that it would be a great deal better for her to carry her tallow and her grease to the tallow-chandler and soap-boiler; to buy soap and candles of him, and thus leave a profit in his hands, which would be (according to your doctrine in page 371) "so much clear gain, so much positive additional wealth, placed at the disposal of the people of the country!"

By — (God forgive me for swearing), you Scotchmen will,

at last, *feelosofise* us out of our senses. I defy you, however, to get out of this scrape. You applaud the blessings which the American Government sheds upon its people ; you produce as a proof of those blessings, the liberty which the Americans have of manufacturing their own brandy, candles, and soap. Having stated this proof of blessing to us, you tell us that your author "*never saw a beggar in any part of the United States :*" and, just in the same Review, you had laid down the doctrine, that for the agricultural people to drive domestic manufactures from them, was the way to add prodigiously to the comforts of all classes.

Now, observe, Gentlemen, here is no loophole to creep out at. To make candles, or brandy, or soap, is full as difficult as to make woollens or linens. A child can spin or can knit. Any two-handed creature can dress flax or hemp. Hemp, flax, and wool are no more the *produce of a farm* than tallow, peaches, potash and grease, are the produce of a farm. Why the devil then it should be advantageous to the agricultural people to manufacture the latter, and not to manufacture the former, it remains for you to explain. The mystery is far too dark and deep for me.

I cannot quit this subject without observing, that you might have found these remarks about candle making, and beer making, and soap making, in my "*Year's Residence,*" or in some of my Registers, long and long enough ago. I gave, long ago, a full account of all these things. The passage which you have quoted, is so nearly in my very words, that if I had not spoken of it as a quotation from your Review, my readers would have taken it for my own. I told them that all my neighbours in Long Island, worked their fat up into candles and into soap, though they were living not more than twenty miles from New York, and though the greater part of them went to New York market once a week. I told my readers, that I bought candles from my neighbour Farmer WIGGINS, until I killed sheep and had tallow of my own. I told them, that the farmers sold candles to the labourers and tradespeople in the country that did not make candles themselves ; and you would persuade us, that this is a vicious distribution of labour ! My tallow would not fetch me at New York a fourth part of its weight in candles ; and, if I had happened to be visited by you in my retreat from SIDMOUTH's Acts, you would have told me that it

was much better for me, and would add greatly to my comfort, to carry on what you call (in page 371) that “*exchanging* “ which is the *vivifying principle* “ of industry; which stimulates “ agriculturists to adopt the best “ system of cultivation.” I should have told you that I saw nothing *vivifying* in exchanging four pounds of tallow for one pound of candles, when a single maid-servant would make me forty pounds of candles in a day.

I now come to the third and last subject of my letter; namely, your opinions relating to the *increased population of France*, and to the cause of that increase. I have frequently had to observe on the insult which is offered to common sense, in this supposition of a recent prodigious increase in the population of all the countries that we talk of. The supposition is perfectly monstrous. But, the truth is, we began to boast about our increase, and our neighbours seem to have followed our example. They, however, are yet far behind us. This rivalry in procreation, is, in fact, a rivalry in *lying*; and, in that respect, we, as a nation, beat all the world. Our *ten millions* (for *Great Britain*) of 1801, we swelled up, in only *twenty years*, to *fourteen*

millions; while the French in more than *thirty* years swelled up their *twenty-four* millions to *thirty* millions. We beat them all to nothing; and, if they do not look sharp, we shall, by including Ireland, surpass them by some millions in the next census. Where this inordinate lying will stop, time only can tell.

But, it is the cause which you give us for this increase. Your object, in the article which I am referring to, (page 367 of the Review) is to show that a division of the land into small proprietorships, is productive of great injury to a state, and great misery to the people. I agree with you, that that law of France, which would, if persevered in, cut the ownerships up into little bits, must be injurious. There could be no such thing, in process of time, as a large house or an old tree. No man ever heard me join Mr. Paine in his notions about the law of primogeniture. I have never yet been able to satisfy myself of the justice or the wisdom of that measure which SIR SAMUEL ROMILLY proposed, which was so popular, and against which the Lord Chancellor and law officers had the wisdom to set their faces; I mean the measure for making freehold lands liable for common contract

debts. I should see no harm, if no man were able to alienate such lands by will. I have a great objection to that which keeps things in a state *never fixed*.

But, there is a great difference between a gradation in the size of estates, and all large ones or all small ones. And, there is also a great difference between ownerships and between renterships. There is no harm can arise from a due proportion of small farms. It is not here as in the case of ownerships ; for, if you divide a thousand acres into twenty *farms*, there is still but one owner of the thousand acres, and the protection of the woods, the securing of the repairs, the keeping up of the fences and of the roads, all still belong to that one owner. It is so manifest, that twenty families upon this estate would be better off than if they were all labourers but one family ; it is so manifest that these twenty families would be worth more to the state than nineteen families of labourers and one family of big farming people. This is so manifest, that one is anxious to hear a reason on the other side. You furnish us with the old reason ; that, by bringing all the means of the twenty into the hands of one, you enable him to go a better way to work, and to

produce upon the thousand acres a larger quantity of food.

This last assertion I believe not to be true. A thousand acres, in the hands of twenty farmers, gives you twenty farm-yards instead of one, and twenty gardens, and twenty pair of women's eyes to look after poultry, pigs and bees. More *corn* would be grown by the single farmer ; but not a twentieth part, perhaps, of the quantity of the articles which I have just mentioned, which are the produce, in a very large proportion, not so much of labour or of money, as they are of *mere care*. There would be besides twenty patches of hemp or of flax ; twenty, or, more likely, forty spinning-wheels, or knitting-needles at work. But, Gentlemen, are the *people nothing*? Take these nineteen families of small farmers, make their men and boys the labourers of the great farmer, cram the nineteen families into beggarly houses on the outskirts of a village or a town, take away every thing in which they prided themselves, and, in place of nineteen decent and moral families, you have a great and loathsome mass of unprincipled and shameless paupers. That which before went to make the lives of these nineteen families pleasant, will make the big farmer rich, and

make the estate a more simple and convenient funnel of taxation; but the change will be productive of misery to ninety-five persons out of the hundred, reckoning each family at five persons.

We have no positive proof, that the moulding of large farms into small ones has produced the misery now prevalent amongst the labourers in England. But, we have these two facts before us, that, during the last fifty years, or thereabouts, and especially during the last thirty, the small farms have been melting away; and we have this other fact, that, during the whole of that time, the lot of the labouring classes has been growing worse and worse; till, at last, the Parliament itself tells us that the state of the once decent and happy English labourer, is now that of misery and degradation in the extreme. Other causes have, doubtless, contributed largely towards this fatal event; but, in the face of these undeniable facts, it seems a little too much, pertinaciously to preach up that small farms are productive of misery to the people.

But, we have not yet looked at *one of your consequences* of the division of the land into small occupations. I am yet to learn what harm there can be in this conse-

quence, suppose it to be such. It appears to me monstrous to lament an increase in the numbers of the people, as long as mouths never come without hands, and as long as the land is as yet in a state but of half cultivation.

However, to deduce such a consequence from a subdivision of the land, adds another to the contradictions put forth by the same set of politicians upon the same subject. The people of Great Britain are said to have swelled up from ten millions to fourteen millions during twenty years. It is notorious, that during this increase of population there has been a diminution in the degree of four or five to one in the number of farms. It has been the practice of great estate holders everywhere to run out the little *life holders*. Here a numerous class of proprietors have been swept away. The farms have been moulded nine or ten into one. The cottagers on the skirts of commons have been swept by thousands upon thousands from their little bits of land; and, all this time, the population has been going on increasing most prodigiously; marvellous and miraculous; while (oh! wonderous principle of population!) in the neighbouring kingdom of France, which is only just across the

channel, you tell your readers, that in twenty years the population has increased from twenty-eight millions to thirty millions ; " and " that this increase could not possibly have taken place but for " the DIVISION OF THE " LAND CAUSED BY THE " REVOLUTION" !

I am, Gentlemen,
Your most obedient, and
Most humble Servant,
W.M. COBBETT.

THE THING.

I COPY the following paragraph from the Winchester Paper. It characterizes the THING in a most surprisingly striking manner. " In June last an order was circulated, suspending the issuing of half-pay to officers in the army, who had taken holy orders. It was immediately afterwards perceived, that if this order were to have a retrospective effect, it would operate with great hardship, and indeed with injustice, on individuals who had acted on the faith of existing regulations, which regarded the half-pay as a compensation of past services, and had (some of them with the

" express approbation of superior authority) entered upon a profession for which they were fully qualified. The Lords of the Treasury, therefore, have taken the order into further consideration, and have decided, as the justice of the case required, that no half-pay shall be issued subsequently to the 25th of Dec. next, to officers who may hereafter enter into holy orders ; but that the measure shall not be retrospective."

This is a perfect jewel. In the first place, the orders of the Lords of the Treasury are, it seems, equal to laws. Ah ! to be sure they are ; and they are better, as they cost us less money. As to the "full qualifications" of the sons and nephews and brothers and cousins of the Lord Charleses, as to their "full qualifications" for the "Holy Orders," after casting off the whiskers and blue and buff, who can doubt that, when, as we have seen at Skibbereen, that tithes are sometimes collected by force of arms !

But, there is a little *hitch* for the THING, after all. The THING says, if this paragraph speaks truth, that the half-pay is given "as a compensation for past services." What a double-dealing THING thou art ! For,

didst thou not tell SIR BOBBY WILSON, that the half-pay was a *retainer for future services*? And, was he not *stripped of his half-pay* after very long past services, at the risk of leaving his family almost to want bread? And (oh! thou art a pretty THING!) didst thou not tell SIR BOBBY this, after it had been declared by the Lord Charleses, that the Clerical character was *indelible*; after they had declared this, in order to get and keep Mr. HORNE TOOKE away; after this, thou toldest poor SIR BOBBY that the half-pay was a *retainer for future services*, and that, therefore, it might, without any ceremony, be taken from him; though now thou sayest, that it is "*a compensation for past services*;" and that it would therefore be unjust to take it from the late *whisker-men*, who, since the war, have declared at the altar, that they "*believed themselves called "by the Holy Ghost* to take upon '*them the care of souls*' !!!

Oh! but this is not to be the case *in future!* Thank you, THING; but, then, you know very well that all the quarter-deck and whisker-men who were at all likely to have "*a call*," have had *before now*, especially if this paragraph be true, they have had *six months* wherein to obey "*the*

call." Well done, THING: if there be thy match on the face of the earth, the devil's in't.

Now, then, we shall see whether other half-pay officers will be *blotted out*. We shall see whether any Member of Parliament will call for a *law to put a stop* to such blotting out, nothing being more frequent than such blotting out, to the utter ruin of the poor men and their families. But we shall see more than this: for we shall see whether SIR BOBBY WILSON will bring this flagrant matter forward; we shall see whether this crack champion of the "*rights and liberties*" of the people; this choice representative of my wise and boozing countrymen of the Borough, will come forward like a *man* upon this occasion, whether he will blaze up once more, or, whether, after all his talk, he will twinkle down, and go out in the socket.

LORD COCHRANE.

South America is, at this time, the grand reservoir of lies. Therefore, in re-publishing the following article from the Morning Chronicle, let me not be understood as giving credit to a word of it.

" The following is an Extract
" of a Letter, dated in Pernambuco, on the 19th August, and received this morning by an eminent mercantile establishment.
" Royalty does not suit the sentiments of the Northern Provinces of the Brazilian Empire.

" (EXTRACT).

" We are in hopes to be able soon to advise the restoration of tranquillity here, as Lord COCHRANE, in the Don Pedro Pre-miero line of battle ship, arrived yesterday, and we understand his Lordship has landed troops to the southward. What his intentions are, we know not, but active measures will, no doubt, be resorted to. The annexed letter was yesterday addressed by him to the British Consul. We cannot for a moment suppose he will put his threats into execution, with regard to the filling up the harbour, and we are at a loss to conceive his meaning." &c. &c.

" (COPY).

" In pursuance of the commands of his Imperial Majesty the Emperor of BRAZIL, to adopt the most speedy and effectual means for terminating the anarchy which exists in the Northern Provinces; and con-

sidering Pernambuco as the source and centre of the evil, it is my intention to fill up the entrance of the port of Pernambuco, by means of sinking and blowing up vessels laden with stones, &c.; and I give you information thereof, in order that you may take such immediate steps with regard to British vessels as you shall judge proper.

" COCHRANE E MARANHAO.

" Given on board the Imperial Brazilian ship the Pedro Pri-mero, 18th August, 1824.

" The Marquess of MARANHAO, should he put this threat into execution, will certainly adopt an extraordinary plan for gaining the affections of the Northern Provinces towards the Government of Don PEDRO the First, although it is perfectly consistent with all the laws of modern legitimacy.

" The following is extracted from another letter, of the same date, from Pernambuco, and on the same subject:

" We have merely to hand a copy of what we wrote to you the 15th, and as yet cannot advise any political change in the place. Lord COCHRANE, in a line of battle ship, came off the

" harbour yesterday, which caused
 " considerable alarm amongst the
 " Republican party, who were
 " under arms the greater part of
 " last night, in expectation of his
 " Lordship landing forces to take
 " possession of the forts. He has
 " communicated to the different
 " Consuls that, by order of his
 " Imperial Majesty, he will pro-
 " ceed to destroy the port by
 " sinking vessels loaded with
 " stones at the different entrances;
 " but we cannot suppose he will
 " be guilty of such an act of
 " madness. He has ordered the
 " packet that arrived from Fal-
 " mouth last night to proceed this
 " afternoon, and after to-day, no
 " vessel to enter or leave the port.
 " We have some hopes of seeing
 " a speedy termination to the
 " troubles of the province, as we
 " are informed he landed troops
 " to the southward or northward,
 " we cannot ascertain which. In
 " business, nothing whatever do-
 " ing, &c. &c."

Now, mind, reader, I do not think it safe for you to believe one single word of all this. If it were true, it would certainly be a curious turn of things, that his Lordship should go out to fight for the independence of the people of South America, and that he should

now be in the service of an Emperor, and employed in subjugating the people to his control; or, in other words, for that is the *real object*, employed in assisting the son of the king of Portugal to bring the *Brazillian territory back under the sway of his most faithful Majesty!*

However, let it be so. Nay, let his Lordship be "*E. MARANHAO*," which, it seems, means *Marquis*, or some other cursed foolish thing, of this Maranhao. Let him do, or let him be, what he may, so that I have not the mortification to see him put on again the *livery of the THING*, as it was, a little while ago, notified in the papers he was about to do. I have no doubt but the "*patriots*," who are so eager to sell their country to the Jews in London, that the former may be able to pocket the proceeds; I have no doubt but these unprincipled plunderers, who cherish "*liberty*" as the cursed caterpillars are cherishing my cabbages; I have no doubt but they have behaved very ungratefully and dishonestly towards **LORD COCHRANE**. So that, I am by no means disposed to blame him for doing what he is now said to be doing. Besides, I have a firm reliance on his honour and justice. And, at any rate, "*E. Maranhao*,"

or *E. Devil*: any thing but see him again in the *Livery of the Lord Charleses!* My nerves are not very weak; but, I never could stand the sight of him in that harness, which he never can resume without loading himself with infamy for life.

THE BIBLE
AND
THE BAYONET;
OR
TRUE CHURCH MILITANT.

THE "Church of England," as it is called, has, from its very beginning, been supported, in a great measure, by force of arms; but, that branch of it which exists in Ireland, openly and at all times seems to rely greatly on this species of support. When Christ told the Apostle *to put up his sword*, when he so strictly forbade all *fighting*, his Apostles could scarcely have anticipated a Church of *Christ*, the Clergy of which would collect their *tithes* by the means of *armed men*. Never could they have dreamed of battles like that of SKIBBEREEN! Never could they have imagined, that a minister of the Gospel of the meek and merciful Jesus would be seen sallying forth at

the head of soldiers, to compel his flock to give him money or goods!

These reflections have been called forth by a most curious scene lately, as the newspapers tell us, exhibited at Loughrea, in Ireland, at a *Bible-meeting*, at which, it seems, the *Protestant Archbishop of Tuam* presided. I shall first insert the account, as I find it given in the *MORNING HERALD*; and then offer some remarks upon it.

"At Loughrea, on Tuesday last, a meeting of the County of Galway Bible Society was convened in the Court-house of that town, upon which occasion his Grace the Archbishop of Tuam had signified his assent to the wishes of the Society, by taking the Chair. On the arrival of his Grace and the Committee, it was found that the place of meeting had been taken possession of by a crew of ruffians, while bands of miscreants, armed with clubs, beset every avenue. It was with great difficulty the Reverend Prelate himself succeeded in penetrating to the Chair, and a number of the friends of the Institution, who had contemplated taking part in the proceedings, were altogether excluded. Notwith-

" standing these evident appearances of a hostile intention on the part of the populace, the business of the meeting proceeded quietly till the Report had been read; and the respected Chairman had put the question in the customary way, when suddenly a scene ensued which beggars description. The mob, as if by a preconcerted signal, burst out into hideous yells, and the voices of the gentlemen present were drowned by the most terrific outcries. Brandishing clubs, threats, and even, in many instances, personal attacks were resorted to. The Rev. Archbishop, and the promoters of the Meeting, with difficulty escaped from the fury of the assailants. We have seen letters which describe the tumult to have been of the most appalling description, and which state that things at one time wore so serious an aspect, that the officer on guard at the barracks adjoining the Court-house, ordered the troops out, in full expectation that the interposition of the military would become necessary for the protection of the lives of the respectable attendants at the meeting.—The following is an extract from a letter we have received from

" Loughrea:—‘ Mr. Daly, a Popish Priest of Galway, stood up to oppose the Resolutions, and was proceeding to address the Meeting, when he was asked if he were a Member.—After giving an evasive answer, he was informed that he *could not be permitted to speak*.—Mr. Daly, finding his efforts unavailing, informed his Grace that he must do what would be very unpleasant to him. He, therefore, moved *that his Grace should leave the Chair*. The Archbishop, in a most dignified manner, informed him that he would not comply with his wishes, unless compelled by force. This was approved of by the Members. The scene of tumult and uproar which followed this *spirited reply* of his Grace, baffles description.—Cries of ‘*Out, out*—no *Chair*, no *Chair*,’ followed from the mob, mingled with yells of the most *frightful* description. Having thus far succeeded in his wishes, Mr. Daly addressed his noisy followers, and desired them to go to the *Chapel*, where they would be at liberty to speak and discuss the matter freely before *their Bishop*. Part followed him to the Chapel, and the remainder continued to

" disturb the Meeting in the most
" tumultuous manner, so that an
" adjournment became unavoid-
" able, without any opportunity
" being afforded to several Mem-
" bers who had intended to deliver
" their sentiments on the occa-
" sion."

This, observe, is from an *Orangeman*. Yet, what have we other than a proof, that all the disturbance rose out of the Archbishop's *refusal to let the Catholics speak in their defence*? The meeting was a public one; it was held in the court-house of the town; all persons had a right to attend and to be heard. The notorious object of the Bible-people in Ireland is to circumvent the Catholic religion. Had not a priest of that religion a right to be *heard*? And why not hear him? Was the Archbishop *afraid of his arguments*? Is this the cause that is to be so successful?

And, how did the Catholic priest act? Did he excite to violence? No: He invited the people away to their own Chapel, where they might, before their own Bishop, discuss the matter freely. The gentleman of *Tuam* had seen the effect of Mr. Es-MONDE's speech at Waterford. He had heard the *question put*

by him; and he had not a mind to expose himself to shame and disgrace, such as befel the Bible-people at that meeting.

Oh! there is a *barrack* adjoining the Court-house, is there? And so, "the *officer on guard* ordered out *the troops*." Ah! these are the Irish *settlers of disputed points in theology and morality*! They, indeed, settle every thing; they collect *taxes*, they collect *tithes*, and now they come to support the *Bible-men*! They are the *trumps*, the trump-cards, kept in till wanted; but, when wanted, out they come. They always succeed for the moment. They *triumph*; but their triumph is the defeat, in the end, of those who use them. The moment we hear that the Bible-men (no matter from what cause) stood in need of *troops*, that moment we decide that the Bible men were *in the wrong*.

But, had the Archbishop no *other arms* wherewith to combat his foes? Had he not read the "*LUTRIN*" of BOILEAU, and seen how a Bishop beat his enemies in that poem? The Bishop of the "*LUTRIN*" had a quarrel with the canons of his church. The parties were met to debate the matter. The Bishop found himself hard pressed. From words his enemies

were proceeding to something more substantial; when the Bishop all of a sudden drew forth his *right hand* and proceeded to give his foes his BENEDICTION! This was a master-stroke. "On your knees! on your knees!" the spectator crowd cried out. Down they came on their knees; and, as the poet concludes, "*slank away at last, dismayed and blest:*" "*éperdus et benis.*" One of the leaders amongst the canons crept into a corner (out of sight, as he thought,) to escape the benediction; but the Bishop seeing him, "made "a feint towards the right, then "suddenly turning to his left, took "a lucky aim, and *blessed the unfortunate canon.*"

Now, though "*la dextre vengeresse*" (the avenging right-hand) of the Archbishop of Tuam would not have brought the Catholic crowd on their *knees*, it would I dare say, have made them use their *feet*, and scamper off like scalded cats. This, therefore, is the sort of arms for Bishops to make use of in support of the Bible-scheme. To be sure that three-sided piece of *sharp-pointed steel*, which the *trumps* carry about them, is, for the moment, a complete *answer* to Mr. DALY, or to anybody else: but then, such an answer does not *read well*, when it gets into print.

In short, the "*officer on guard at the Barracks*" seems to have given the last blow to the *Bible-schemers*. This is the *end* of all dispute. No man can now think that gentle persuasion only was intended. The London MORNING HERALD has on this subject a very sensible article, concluding with an earnest recommendation to the Bible-saints to desist from their mischievous intermeddling, a recommendation which they will do well to follow, if they be not absolutely ambitious of disgrace.

BIBLE-FIGHT.

THE Catholics, in Ireland, having defeated the Bible-men at the meetings of these latter, are now calling public meetings in their turn, and inviting their opponents to open discussion. They will invite in vain: the *arguments* are all on the side of the Catholics. ROUSSEAU was so thoroughly convinced of this, that he said—
“ If I were a *Christian*, I would certainly be a *Catholic.*”

The Morning Chronicle of to-day (Thursday), has inserted some account of one of these Catholic meetings, and, in the

course of the Editor's observations on it, he says this :

" That the *Reformation* has " been productive of good effects, " will be admitted even by those " who may think the Catholics " have the *best of the argument*. " The very diversity of sects to " which free inquiry necessarily " leads, and against which so " much has been said by Catho- " lics, has tended to emancipate " the lower orders from ecclesiasti- " cal dominion, and to promote " mental independence."

Now, I do not pretend to be far North enough to understand much about "mental independence;" but, I stand engaged to prove, in my little work, the first Number of which will be published on the 29th instant, "that the *Protestant Reformation*, " in *England and Ireland*, has "injured and degraded the people "of both countries." What, are the "lower orders" of Protestants "emancipated from ecclesiastical dominion"? Has the Chronicle so soon forgotten the "unpaid"? Has he forgotten Parson HAY, Doctor COLSTON, and Parson DENT, and the Northallerton *tread-mill*? Does he know in what manner the Parsons in England act generally towards the "lower orders"? And has he forgotten

Mr. HUME's picture of the Church of Ireland; and has he forgotten the renowned battle, won by Parson MORRITT at SKIRBEREEN? The Chronicle forgets; but, before my little work has come to an end, nobody will forget.

To the Editor of the Hampshire Chronicle and Southampton Courier.

SIR—I find, in your Paper of the 1st instant, the following paragraph, which, indeed, I have seen in many other English newspapers:—" It is stated in a Dublin paper that a seat in Parliament " is to be procured for Mr. Cob- " bett, as the advocate of Catholic " emancipation; the expense to be " paid out of the Catholic rent."

Now, Sir, pray receive from me, and have the goodness to assert in your next paper, this explicit declaration: That I do not know what may be the wishes or intentions of the Catholics as to the above matter; but that, if the Irish Catholics in a body, or the English Catholics, or, both united, were to send a deputation to me, informing me that they had a seat vacant, and quite ready for me, I WOULD NOT ACCEPT OF IT, though I should not fail to

express a deep sense of the honour and the last of them *repeals* done me. Oh no, Sir! to be zealous in a cause *for the sake of what he may get by it*, is what shall never be even suspected of,

Sir,

Your most obedient and

Most humble Servant,

W.M. COBBETT.

This day is published,

THE LAW OF TURNPIKES;
or, an Analytical Arrangement of,
and Illustrative Commentaries on,
all the General Acts, relative to
Turnpike Roads.—By WILLIAM
COBBETT, Jun. Student of Lin-
coln's Inn.—Price 3s. 6*d.* in
boards.

This work, which has been brought to a price calculated to place it within the reach of numerous persons, contains *every particle of the General Turnpike Laws now in force*. There are, altogether, *five Acts* passed since 1822, inclusive. Two of these Acts are of great length,

nearly one half of the clauses in the first. So that to take them as they are, they are calculated to do, for the common reader, nothing but *bewilder* him, and lead him into *error*. In this work, the *repealed clauses* in the first Act, and the *repealing clauses* in the second Act, are left out; and nothing but *is now law* is retained; but the whole of what is *now law* is retained, and in the very words of the Acts.—Then, in order to make the divers matters as clear as possible, all the clauses of the Acts, which relate to one matter, are *brought together under one head*. So that the reader, by looking at any particular head, finds there all the Acts say relating to one matter, or branch of the subject; and, for the purpose of aiding the reader, and saving his time, there is, prefixed to each head, or branch, a *short commentary*, showing the true intent and meaning of the several clauses which follow under that same head, or branch of the subject.

AMERICAN TREES.

I HAVE not time to make out my List this week. There is time enough, however; for the leaves are not yet off.

FOR SALE.

A TRUE bred SUFFOLK CART-MARE COLT, rising three years old, fifteen hands high, very handsome, good bone, and colour bright sorrel. She would do well for a

heavy gig, being perfectly gentle in harness, and very free and spirited at work.—Price 26*l.* Apply to JESSE PYM, Colley Farm, Riegate, Surrey.

TO MY FRIENDS.

THEY will be glad to hear that my health is mending apace. I hope to be able to get into the country in a fortnight or three weeks.

MARKETS.

Average Prices of CORN throughout ENGLAND, for the week ending 23d October.

<i>Per Quarter.</i>	<i>s.</i>	<i>d.</i>
Wheat	59	10
Rye	34	4
Barley	40	8
Oats	20	9
Beans	40	11
Peas	40	0

Corn Exchange, Mark Lane.

Quantities and Prices of British Corn, &c. sold and delivered in this Market, during the week ended Saturday, 23d October.

<i>Qrs.</i>	<i>£.</i>	<i>s.</i>	<i>d.</i>	<i>s. d.</i>
Wheat	10,210	for 33,416	1	5 Average, 65 5
Barley..	5,449....	12,239	6	6.....44 11
Oats....	4,768....	5,505	12	2.....23 1
Rye	15....	24	9	0.....32 7
Beans	2,690....	6,058	18	2.....45 0
Peas....	1,741....	3,849	5	10.....44 2

Friday, Oct. 29.—There has not been much Corn of any kind fresh up to-day, and as fine dry samples of New Wheat are scarce, our Millers were obliged to give rather more money for such than on Monday, but the prices of other qualities are unaltered. In Barley, Beans, and Peas, there is no variation from Monday. Good sweet Oats sell with tolerable freedom at Monday's prices, but other kinds are dull.

Monday, Nov. 1.—The arrivals of most kinds of Grain last week were only moderate. This morning there is a plentiful supply of Barley, but not much other Grain fresh up. Superfine samples of Wheat are scarce,

and our Millers wanting such, they gave 2s. to 3s. per quarter more for those descriptions, but other kinds do not partake equally of the improvement.

Barley is now abundant, and superfine malting samples barely maintain last week's terms, but all other sorts are 1s. to 2s. per quarter lower. Old Beans maintain their value; New are rather cheaper. White Peas are rather dearer, and Grey Peas are 2s. per quarter higher. Good Oats are not plentiful, and such sold freely on rather better terms, but other qualities remain much the same as last quoted. The top price of Flour is advanced to 70s. per sack.

Price on board Ship as under.

Flour, per sack	65s. — 70s.
— Seconds,	60s. — 65s.
— North Country ..	55s. — 58s.
Foreign Oats	17s. — 21s.

Account of Wheat, &c. arrived in the Port of London, from Oct. 25 to Oct. 30, both inclusive.

<i>Qrs.</i>		<i>Qrs.</i>
Wheat....	5,234	Tares..... 337
Barley ..	5,043	Linseed .. 235
Malt	3,392	Rapeseed.. 94
Oats	1,093	Brank —
Beans ...	2,069	Mustard .. 83
Flour....	7,758	Flax —
Rye.....	11	Seeds 816
Peas	929	

Foreign.—Oats, 8,180 quarters.

Price of Bread.—The price of the 4 lb. Loaf is stated at 11d. by the full-priced Bakers.

Total Quantity of Corn returned as
Sold in the Maritime Districts, for
the Week ended Oct. 23.

Qrs.	Qrs.
Wheat	54,846 Oats 14,318
Rye	444 Beans.... 4,212
Barley	29,533 Peas 3,005

Price of HOPS per Cwt. in the
Borough.

Monday, Nov. 1.—During the last few days we have had a brisk demand for Hops, in both pockets and bags, at an advance of 3s. to 4s. per cwt.—Sussex pockets, 102s. to 118s.; Kent, 105s. to 140s. Bags, 102s. to 125s.

Maidstone, Oct. 28.—We have this last week had a better trade for Hops, which are dearer and much inquired after, particularly good Middle Kent bags, and they are now getting in few hands. The duty is said not to exceed 140,000*l.* Prices, pockets from 100s. to 112s. to 120s. per cwt.; bags 100s. to 105s. to 112s.

Monday, Nov. 1.—The arrivals from Ireland last week were 325 firkins of Butter, and 210 bales of Bacon; and from Foreign Ports 8753 casks of Butter.

City, 3d November, 1824.

BACON.

On Board, 57s. to 58s. Landed:
Old, 52s. to 54s.; New, 62s.

BUTTER.

The stock of Irish being much short of what has been usual at this time of the year, and the season for the consumption of that kind being at hand, a further advance is likely; especially as the Irish Markets are considerably above *this*. On Board: Carlow, 96s.; Waterford, Dublin, or Limerick, 92s. to 93s—Landed: Carlow, 98s.; Waterford, Dublin, or Limerick, 94s. to 96s.; Dutch, 102s. to 104s.

CHEESE.

Prices continue nearly the same. There is very little *old*, of any kind, left on hand.

SMITHFIELD, Monday, Nov. 1.

Per Stone of 8 pounds (alive).

	s. d.	s. d.
Beef	3 0	to 4 2
Mutton.....	3 10	— 4 4
Veal	4 6	— 5 6
Pork	4 6	— 5 6
Beasts	3,137	Sheep ... 20,010
Calves.....	180	Pigs..... 230

NEWGATE, (same day.)

Per Stone of 8 pounds (dead).

	s. d.	s. d.
Beef	2 8	to 3 4
Mutton.....	3 0	— 4 0
Veal	3 4	— 5 4
Pork	4 0	— 6 0

LEADENHALL, (same day.)

Per Stone of 8 pounds (dead).

	s. d.	s. d.
Beef	2 4	to 3 6
Mutton.....	3 2	— 3 10
Veal	3 4	— 5 4
Pork	3 8	— 5 4

POTATOES.

SPITALFIELDS—per Ton.					
Ware.....	£4	0	to	5	10
Middlings..	2	3	—	2	6
Chats	2	0	—	2	3
Common Red	4	0	—	4	10
Onions..	4s.	6d.—5s.	0d.	per bush.	

BOROUGH.—per Ton.

WARE					
Middlings ..	2	5	—	2	10
Chats.....	1	15	—	2	5
Common Red	3	10	—	4	5

HAY and STRAW, per Load.

Smithfield.—	Hay....	60s.	to	105s.
	Straw ..	40s.	to	50s.
	Clover..	80s.	to	130s.
St. James's.—	Hay....	65s.	to	115s.
	Straw ..	40s.	to	57s.
	Clover..	80s.	to	115s.
Whitechapel.—	Hay....	70s.	to	110s.
	Straw ..	42s.	to	50s.
	Clover..	90s.	to	130s.

COAL MARKET, Oct. 29.

Ships at Market.	Ships sold.	Price.
10 Newcastle..	10 ..	34s. 0d. to 42s. 3d.
6 Sunderland	6 ..	34s. 6d.—41s. 3d.

COUNTRY CORN MARKETS.

By the QUARTER, excepting where otherwise named; from Wednesday to Saturday last, inclusive.

The Scotch Markets are the Returns of the Week before.

	Wheat.	Barley.	Oats.	Beans.	Pease.
	s. to s. d.				
Aylesbury	60 74 0	38 44 0	22 26 0	22 48 0	42 46 0
Banbury.....	60 66 8	39 42 0	26 30 0	40 48 0	0 0 0
Basingstoke	56 76 0	35 48 0	22 26 0	40 54 0	0 0 0
Bridport.....	54 60 0	34 36 0	16 0 0	44 0 0	0 0 0
Chelmsford.....	60 78 0	35 51 0	20 22 0	30 46 0	36 40 0
Derby.....	66 70 0	38 50 0	23 30 0	48 54 0	0 0 0
Devizes.....	52 76 0	40 50 0	28 31 6	50 52 0	0 0 0
Dorchester.....	50 68 0	28 40 0	21 30 0	46 49 0	0 0 0
Exeter.....	68 78 0	36 40 0	18 0 0	40 0 0	0 0 0
Guildford	0 0 0	0 0 0	0 0 0	0 0 0	0 0 0
Henley	58 82 0	36 50 0	22 30 0	42 60 0	38 46 0
Horncastle.....	54 63 0	30 43 0	18 25 0	47 48 0	0 0 0
Hungerford.....	58 74 0	40 45 0	22 29 0	45 50 0	0 0 0
Lewes	48 72 0	41 0 0	24 25 0	0 0 0	0 0 0
Lynn	54 64 0	32 44 0	20 24 0	44 48 0	38 40 0
Newbury	58 78 0	34 49 0	25 33 0	42 60 0	44 50 0
Newcastle	46 64 0	32 46 0	21 28 0	36 42 0	38 44 0
Northampton....	60 67 0	40 43 0	23 28 6	43 47 0	0 0 0
Nottingham....	63 0 0	25 0 0	28 0 0	42 0 0	0 0 0
Reading	58 85 0	35 51 0	24 29 0	40 54 0	42 45 0
Stamford.....	56 67 0	33 45 0	20 30 0	43 50 0	0 0 0
Swansea	60 0 0	32 0 0	17 0 0	0 0 0	0 0 0
Truro	65 0 0	37 0 0	26 0 0	0 0 0	0 0 0
Uxbridge	66 84 0	33 48 0	23 29 0	34 53 0	45 47 0
Warminster.....	48 70 0	34 46 0	21 30 0	54 58 0	0 0 0
Winchester.....	0 0 0	0 0 0	0 0 0	0 0 0	0 0 0
Yarmouth.....	60 68 0	28 45 0	24 28 0	44 48 0	34 55 0
Dalkeith*	26 31 0	15 30 0	15 26 0	15 22 0	0 0 0
Haddington*....	20 31 0	25 31 0	18 22 0	18 22 0	18 22 0

* Dalkeith and Haddington are given by the *boll*.—The Scotch *boll* for Wheat, Rye, Pease, and Beans, is three per cent. more than 4 bushels. The *boll* of Barley and Oats, is about 6 bushels Winchester, or as 6 to 8 compared with the English *quarter*.

Liverpool, Oct. 26.—The prices of Wheat and Oats fluctuated very much last week, but at the termination of it they settled at much the same as those of last Tuesday. At this day's market there were very few buyers, and the supplies of Wheat, Oats, and Flour being very considerable, (including those which remained over from the last week,) Wheat met an extremely dull sale, and scarcely realised the prices of this day se'nnight for the finest parcels. There is in consequence very little variation from the quotations of Tuesday last.

Norwich, Oct. 30.—Wheat 60s. to 68s.; Barley, 32s. to 45s.; Oats, 25s. to 30s.; Beans, 36s. to 42s. per quarter.

Bristol, Oct. 30.—The sales of all kinds of Grain, &c. here are very brisk, and the following prices are easily obtained:—Best Wheat from 8s. 3d. to 8s. 9d.; new ditto, 6s. 6d. to 7s. 9d.; inferior ditto, 5s. to 6s.; Barley, 3s. to 5s. 6d.; Beans, 3s. 6d. to 6s. 3d.; Oats, 2s. 3d. to 3s. 2d.; and Malt, 5s. 9d. to 7s. 9d. per bushel. Flour, Seconds, 50s. to 55s. per bag.

Birmingham, Oct. 28.—A heavy market, but no material alteration of the prices of this day se'nnight.

Ipswich, Oct. 30.—We had to-day a large supply of both Wheat and Barley; the former was rather dearer, and the latter cheaper. Prices as follow:—Wheat, 60s. to 72s.; Barley, 31s. to 45s.; New Beans, 34s. to 39s.; Peas, 36s. to 38s.; and Oats, 18s. to 24s. per qr.

Wakefield, Oct. 29.—The supply of Grain this week is pretty considerable. The Liverpool market continuing so much below ours, and rendering the sale of Flour, at fair prices, in Lancashire very difficult, causes a dulness in the trade here. Very little business has been transacted in Wheat to-day, and to make sales, a decline of full 2s. per quarter must be submitted to, on both New and Old. Barley continues in a depressed state; the Maltsters buy very reluctantly, anticipating lower prices, together with the impression that the ports may open in November. Oats and Shelling are both dull sale, and in some instances rather lower. Beans have declined 2s. to 3s. per quarter. No alteration in Malt. Very little doing in Rapeseed: the improved accounts of the fisheries tend rather to depress this article.—Wheat, Old, 55s. to 64s.; New, 57s. to 66s. per 60 lbs.; Barley, Old, 36s. to 38s.; New, 40s. to 43s. per qr.; Beans, New, 48s. to 50s.; Old, 52s. per 63 lbs.; Oats, 26s. to 28s. per quarter; Mealing Oats, 12d. to 13d. per stone; Shelling, 30s. to 31s.; New, 32s.; Malt, 42s. to 46s.; and Flour, 44s. to 46s. per load. Rapeseed, 25l. to 27l. per last.

COUNTRY CATTLE AND MEAT MARKETS, &c.

Norwich Castle Meadow, Oct. 30.—Fat Beef, 6s. 9d. to 7s. 6d.; Mutton, 6s. 3d. to 6s. 9d.; Pork, 6s. 6d. to 7s. 3d. per stone of 14 lbs.

Horncastle, Oct. 30.—Beef, 6s. 6d. to 7s. per stone of 14 lbs.; Mutton, 5d. to 6d.; Veal, 6d. to 8d. and Pork, 7d. per lb.

Morpeth market, on Wednesday last, had rather a short supply of Cattle and Sheep: there being few buyers, prices continues much the same:—Beef, from 5s. 3d. to 5s. 9d.; Mutton, 5s. 6d. to 6s. 6d. per stone, sinking offal.

There was more Cheese pitched at *Winchester* Fair Monday se'nnight than was expected, and though the sale was dull, higher prices were realised than at *Giles's Hill*: a considerable quantity was left for the second day, which fully supported Monday's price. There were only two or three fine dairies of Old Cheese, which fetched 86s. The quality of the New Cheese was very good, and the prices were—Best Somerset, 65s. to 78s.; Half Coward, 40s. to 56s.; Ordinary and Skim, 28s. to 38s.

AVERAGE PRICE OF CORN, sold in the Maritime Counties of England and Wales, for the Week ended Oct. 23, 1824.

	<i>Wheat.</i>	<i>Barley.</i>	<i>Oats.</i>				
	<i>s.</i>	<i>d.</i>	<i>s.</i>	<i>d.</i>	<i>s.</i>	<i>d.</i>	
London*	64	0....47	5....23	2			
Essex	62	6....41	1....22	5			
Kent	66	3....42	10....23	8			
Sussex	62	8....41	0....22	6			
Suffolk	59	5....39	6....23	6			
Cambridgeshire	59	6....36	8....18	2			
Norfolk	56	7....38	8....21	6			
Lincolnshire	60	4....41	4....18	9			
Yorkshire	55	9....38	3....19	11			
Durham	56	5....34	0....23	6			
Northumberland	53	6....34	10....21	3			
Cumberland	54	8....34	0....20	3			
Westmoreland	60	1....36	0....22	0			
Lancashire	57	3....0	0....22	3			
Cheshire	59	4....46	9....23	3			
Gloucestershire	62	7....41	9....26	9			
Somersetshire	61	6....33	9....19	10			
Monmouthshire	62	5....39	8....20	0			
Devonshire	59	1....35	2....22	0			
Cornwall	59	3....33	6....22	11			
Dorsetshire	59	7....35	2....21	6			
Hampshire	59	10....36	10....23	8			
North Wales	55	7....37	3....19	3			
South Wales	53	6....30	10....15	3			

* The London Average is always that of the Week preceding.